



Illinois Department of Transportation

Division of Highways / District 4
401 Main Street / Peoria, Illinois / 61602-1111

August 25, 1995

STUDIES & PLANS - PHASE I
FA Route 315 (IL 336)
FA Routes 310 & 315 (Macomb Bypass)
Hancock & McDonough Counties
Job No. P-94-152-91
Catalog No. 030010-01

Mr. James Hartwig
Department of Agriculture
Division of Natural Resources
Agriculture Building, State Fairgrounds
Springfield, IL 62706-1001

Dear Mr. Hartwig:

A meeting was held at the District 4 office on August 22, 1995 to discuss preliminary alternate alignments on the Macomb Bypass project as well as alignment revisions on the IL Route 336 project from Carthage to Macomb. Those in attendance at the meeting were as follows:

Tom Lacy	- IDOT, District 4
Paula Green	- IDOT, District 4
Mike Bruns	- BD&E
John Rowley	- BD&E (Ag. Coordinator)
James Hartwig	- Illinois Dept. of Agriculture

Tom began by first explaining the Macomb Bypass Study area and proposed typical section. The study area, proposed typical, alternate alignment map, and description/comparison of alternates were described in a handout given to all in attendance at the meeting. An aerial map with designated alternates was used to describe alignments in the northwest, northeast, and southern quadrants around Macomb. General characteristics, alignment location description and impacts were discussed for each quadrant.

In regard to the northwest quadrant, Jim Hartwig preferred the alignments which tied into Springlake Road as compared to those that tied into Springview Road. Springview Road is approximately one mile north of Springlake Road. Alignment alternates which tied into Springview Road were longer in length with greater agricultural land affected. Jim also stated he preferred alternates which followed section/property lines or existing roads to reduce property severances. He was not in favor of alignments on diagonals which bisected agricultural ground. It is Jim's opinion that less emphasis should be placed on pastured woodland. Tom mentioned that alternate designated F-8 is the longest in length, displaces the most residences, and restricts Park District expansion and, therefore, is recommended to be dropped from future study.

In regard to the northeast quadrant alternates, Jim favored the G-1/G-3.1 alternate which follows existing roadway and property lines and, therefore, has less property severance. This alternate ties into Springlake Road which is closer to Macomb. Impacts as mentioned in the meeting agenda handout explains the impacts of each alternate G-1, G-2, G-3, G-3.1, G-3.2 and G-4.

Next, alternate alignments for a southerly bypass of Macomb were discussed. Alternate E-3 is closer to Macomb and would impact housing development south of Macomb. An interchange at CH 16 south of Macomb would be difficult due to the existing residential development in the area. Alternate E-4 allows for greater development south of Macomb and would provide a desirable future location for an interchange with CH 16. Alternate E-4 does have more woodland impacts than alternate E-3 due to its proximity to KillJordan Creek. Alternates E-4.1 and E-4.2 were added to try and reduce the length of diagonal alignment and reduce severances.

Jim asked which combination of bypass locations were being considered. Tom responded that the bypass location will later be assessed according to environmental impacts, cost, and function in regard to traffic flow.

The next topic discussed was in regard to alignment revisions on the IL Route 336 project. The first item discussed was the alignment revision at the Rendleman property located south of Carthage on the east side of existing IL Route 94. The two barns, silo, and house on the Rendleman property have been determined potentially historic by the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA). The two barns, silo, and house would require removal using the preferred alternate alignment in which it is proposed to hold the existing west right-of-way line of IL Route 94 and place 4 new lanes to the east of the existing roadway. Modifications to the preferred alignment to avoid building impacts was discussed with IHPA on January 10, 1995. Two alignment alternates were analyzed; one west and the other east of the preferred A-2.1a alignment. A plan view showing each alignment along with an impact table comparison was then discussed. The District prefers the west alternate for the following reasons:

1. Using the "west" alternate, a significant length of existing IL Route 94 pavement could be removed and, therefore, lessen future maintenance costs. The "east" alignment would leave more of existing IL Route 94 in service and, therefore, result in higher future maintenance costs.
2. The "west" alternate utilizes more of the existing IL Route 94 right-of-way and requires seven acres less right-of-way than the "east" alternate. The "west" alternate requires one acre less right-of-way than alternate A-2.1a.
3. The current access pattern to the farm could be maintained using the "west" alternate but could not using the "east" alternate.
4. The "west" alternate would be more aesthetically pleasing as it is more of a sweeping curve rather than the obvious jog in the "east" alternate.

Using the "west" alternate the proposed IL Route 336 centerline would be approximately 92 feet west of the existing IL Route 94 centerline. The house, barns, and silo are located on the east side of IL Route 94. Therefore, using the "west" alternate modification of the A-2.1a alignment the proposed traffic lanes would be farther away from the buildings than currently exist. The preliminary additional cost of the "west" alternate is \$40,000 more than alternate A-2.1a.

Jim Hartwig and John Rowley both agreed that the "west" alternate was a feasible and acceptable alignment.

The final topic on IL Route 336 alignment revisions concerns the IL Route 61/IL Route 336 interchange area.

Tom discussed the realignment of IL 336 to utilize part of U.S. 136 as a frontage road near IL 61, and the revision of the interchange at IL 61 from a high speed trumpet to a diamond type. The diamond interchange will adequately handle the traffic and enable north side frontage road connections directly to the interchange. A tabulation of impacts for the trumpet versus the diamond interchange was then discussed. This tabulation is included with the meeting minutes. Tom pointed out that the diamond interchange would have less impacts in regard to right-of-way and frontage roads, and could be built for less cost than a trumpet interchange.

The access to the adjacent properties was discussed. Tom described how the diamond interchange scheme provides better access for the adjacent properties. Jim agreed that the diamond interchange would be preferred over the trumpet interchange. He further inquired as to the alignment location east of the interchange. Tom explained that it is proposed to hold the existing south right-of-way line on U.S. 136 and place all 4 lanes north of existing. The existing pavement on U.S. 136 would be removed. This would also reduce impacts to the north side of U.S. 136 only.

An alignment where existing U.S. 136 would be used as the eastbound lanes would require right-of-way and impacts on both sides of existing. This concluded our discussion of the Macomb Bypass and IL Route 336 projects. These minutes constitute the writer's understanding of matters discussed and conclusions reached in summary form. In the space below is an area provided for your signature in regard to concurrence to the meeting minutes as contained in this letter.

If you should have any questions, please contact Tom Lacy at (309)671-3462.

Very truly yours,

D. E. Risinger
District Engineer

By: A. C. Mills
A. C. Mills
Program Development Engineer

TAL/pc/tal0012

Encl.

cc: Project File (T. Lacy)
Parsons, Brinckerhoff, Quade & Douglas (Attn: W. Trachsel)
P. Green (Env. Coordinator)
Mike Bruns (BDE)

_____ I concur.

_____ Would like to discuss further.

Signature

Date

Minutes of NEPA/404 Concurrence Meeting
for
FAP Route 10 (U.S. 67) & FAP Route 315 (U.S. 136)
Macomb Area Study
McDonough County
Job No. P-94-152-91
Catalog NO. 031483-00P

On April 30, 1996, the initial NEPA 404/Concurrence Meeting was held at the District No. 4 office in which the proposed study of bypass alternates in the Macomb area was discussed. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss and receive concurrence for the following items.

1. Project Purpose and Need
2. Review of alternate alignments.
3. Based on impacts, suggested alternates to be eliminated from further study and also those to be carried forward for further detailed analysis.

An agenda packet was handed out which contained the meeting format, project study area, typical section, purpose and need section and corresponding exhibits, map of alternate alignments, tabulation of design impacts, and bullet diagram of reasons to not carry selected alignments forward. Refer to the attached attendance sheet for meeting participants.

Dennis Johnson of FHWA began the meeting by addressing the items to be discussed for the Macomb Area Study, which includes the Purpose and Need and alternate alignments. Tom Lacy of IDOT, District No. 4, then initiated the presentation by first describing the project location, study area, and surrounding routes. Next, the expressway typical section used for analysis of alternates was discussed. Upon completing the above mentioned general project overview, the project Purpose and Need was explained. Tom Lacy provided a summary of each section which included the project purpose, history, need, route linkage, local transportation network, and economic development.

Upon completion of summarizing the Purpose and Need, the following items were discussed:

Mike MacMullen of USEPA inquired as to the level of service for traffic in Macomb. Tom responded that the level of service and ADT for highway routes in the Macomb area is not being used to justify a purpose and need for the study. The purpose is based on system linkage and economic development/retention. Mike also asked how the Macomb Area Study would tie into a 2-lane section of U.S. 67 south of Macomb. Paula Green's response was that the NE quadrant would provide continuation of the existing U.S. 67 4-lane section north of Macomb to tie into U.S. 67 at the east edge of Macomb. District No. 6 is currently studying U.S. 67 from the termini of the Macomb Area Study to Jacksonville. This NE quadrant has independent utility. In addition, it was mentioned that the NW quadrant bypass could provide a west to north movement for the proposed 4-lane IL 336 expressway to the existing 4-lane section of U.S. 67 north of Macomb. As mentioned in the Purpose and Need, a combination of alternate corridors to the NE, NW, and south of Macomb are to be evaluated. The corridors are being evaluated as expressway type facilities for both U.S. 67 and IL 336. Upon conclusion of discussing the Purpose and Need statement for the Macomb Area Study, concurrence was requested by Paula Green and received by meeting participants.

The next item for discussion was the review of Macomb bypass alternates, suggested alternates to drop from future study, and the preferred alignments to carry forward for additional refined analysis. An agenda packet which was handed out contained the following information:

1. Map of conceptual alternate alignments for the NE, NW, and southern quadrants around Macomb. Alternates shown include:

NW - F-1, F-3, F-4, F-4.1, F-5, F-5.1, F-6, F-7, F-7.1, F-8
NE - G-1, G-2, G-2.1, G-3, G-3.1, G-3.2, G-3.3, G-4
S - E-3, E-4, E-4.1, E-4.2

2. Existing and projected traffic on existing highway system.
3. Preliminary Summary of Design and Environmental Impacts for all alternates on the NW, NE, and southern study quadrants. The preferred alternate for each quadrant is shown shaded.
4. Tabulation of "Reasons to not Carry Selected Alignments Forward".

Using an aerial mosaic exhibit, Tom first explained the key environmental and land features which affect alignment selection in each of the 3 quadrants of study (NW, NE, and south). Environmental features such as wetlands and woodlands were shown shaded on the aerials as well as alignment alternates and other key impact areas. Next, the alternates were discussed and compared in regard to impacts as tabulated in the "Preliminary Summary of Design and Environmental Impacts" tables. Following is a brief summary of key design impact features, alternates suggested to drop from future study and reasons why, proposed alternates to carry forward for more detailed study, and discussion by meeting participants.

Northwest Quadrant

1. Key Design Impact Features

- * Woodlands bordering the Lamoine River and Springlake Tributary
- * East Fork of Lamoine River
- * Western Illinois University
- * Springlake Park
- * Residential Subdivisions
- * Native Prairie Restoration Area
- * Macomb Airport
- * Existing Roadway Network

2. Alternates suggested to drop

- * (F-1, F-1.1, F-3, F-8) These alternates connect to Springview Road at U.S. Route 67. These alternates have a high number of severances, longer length, more agricultural impacts, limit expansion of the Macomb Airport when combined with the NE quadrant, and require additional realignment of sideroads as compared to alternates that connect in the vicinity of Springlake Road and U.S. Route 67.

Severe intersection skew angles at Springlake Road and Route 1100E would require major realignment to connect to alternates F-1 and F-3. Tom pointed out that the Table of Impacts incorrectly estimates the frontage road requirements for alternates F-1 and F-3. Adjusting for the realignment of Springlake Road, a total of 4240 feet of total frontage road would be required.

- * (F-6, F-7) High woodland impacts, high residential displacements, close proximity to residential subdivision, and passes close to Springlake Park and the Native Prairie Restoration Area.
- * (F-4, F-4.1, F-5) High residential displacements, commercial impact to the radio station transmitter tower for alternate F-4, diagonal severances of farmland, and undesirable angle of intersection with sideroads, requiring major sideroad realignment.

3. Alternates Suggested to Carry Forward

- * (F-5.1) Least number of affected parcels, tied for least acreage of impacted woodlands, and is the optimal alternate in regard to intersection angle and retention of the existing roadway network. The connection to U.S. 67 will allow retention of Springlake and Springview Roads whereas other alternates would require extensive relocation of these sideroads.

4. Discussion Comments

- * Charles Perino mentioned the woodland impacts as shown on the aerial mosaic between Adams Street and Tower Road (refer to Conceptual Alternate Alignments Map for location). Tom explained that the preferred alternate location attempts to minimize woodland impacts as much as possible. Upon field determination of woodland areas, further refinement of the preferred alternate can be made to provide the least impact. It was noted that due to the extent of woodlands in this area, that avoidance is not possible. However, upon further detailed analysis, the impacts will be kept to a minimum.
- * John Betler asked where the wetland impacts were located and Tom responded that all alignments share the same impacted area of 7 acres located just north of U.S. 136 in the area of the Lamoine River. This area of impacted wetland will be further defined upon more detailed field survey.

This concluded discussion comments for the bypass alternates in the NE quadrant. Concurrence was requested by Tom Lacy and received for dropping from future study alternates connecting to Springview Road as well as alternates F-6, F-7, F-5, F-4.1, and F-4. The preferred alternate, F-5.1, which connects to U.S. 67 between Springview and Springlake Roads, will be carried forward for future study and refinements made to minimize environmental/key impacts.

Northeast Quadrant

1. Key Design Impact Features

- * Envirodyne Landfill
- * Macomb Airport
- * Macomb Industrial Park/Bower Road Connection
- * Existing Roadway Network
- * BNRR
- * East Fork of Lamoine River (woodlands and wetlands)
- * Residential Development

2. Alternates Suggested to Drop

- * (G-4) Severe impacts for the intersection connection of Bower Road and 1500N, limits Industrial Park development, and more curves which result in diagonal farmland severances.
- * (G-1) Restricts Macomb Airport expansion, diagonal severances, longest length, undesirable intersection angle with Bower Road, and required realignment of Springview Road.
- * (G-3.1, G-3.3) High wetland and woodland impacts and number of severances.
- * (G-2, G-2.1) Severs road 1500N and disrupts the local road network continuity, large length of required frontage road.

3. Alternates Suggested to Carry Forward

- * (G-2.2 combined with either G-3 or G-3.2) G-2.2 maintains the existing local road network, reduces frontage road requirements, less angular severance and eliminates residential impacts at Springlake Road. Alternates G-3 and G-3.2 will be further evaluated in conjunction with the G-2.2 alternate to minimize wetland/woodland impacts.

4. Discussion Comments

- * John Betler mentioned the Springview Road connection was a mute point due to the fact that this connection was agreed to be deleted from the NW quadrant. Tom Lacy responded that when looking at the combination of NE and NW quadrants together, this is true. However, a south and NE bypass requires an independent review.

This concluded discussion comments for the NE bypass alternate alignments. Concurrence was requested by Tom Lacy and received by meeting participants for previously mentioned alternates to drop and those to carry forward for future study.

South Quadrant

1. Key Design Impact Features

- * Residential Development
- * KillJordan Creek and Tributaries
- * Troublesome Creek

2. Alternates Suggested to Drop

- * (E-3) Proximity to Macomb limits expansion, high potential for significant residential displacement due to location of subdivisions, poor intersection angle with several sideroads which will result in sideroad relocation and added impacts, high number of diagonally severed farmland, and potential access control impacts for an intersection at CH 16.
- * (E-4.2) Highest woodland and wetland of all alternates.

3. Alternates Suggested to Carry Forward

- * (E-4, E-4.1) Allows southward expansion of Macomb, provides a good connection to CH 16 with minimal impacts, low residential displacements, and improved sideroad intersection angles as compared to the E-3 alternate.

4. Discussion

- * Mike MacMullen of USEPA expressed concern over dropping alternate E-3 because, according to the tabulation of impacts, it has less woodland and wetland impacts than the E-4 alternates. Mike did not see the one non-farm residential displacement shown on the impacts table as significant in the area of CH 16 and the bypass alignment. Tom explained the non-farm residential displacement was determined from a 1993 flight and that the impacts table has not been updated according to the recent April 1996 flight which shows additional residential development in the intersection area of CH 16 and the E-3 alignment. Mike requested additional information in regard to future zoning and subdivision layout in the area of CH 16 and the E-3 alternates. The magnitude of residential displacement needs to be further defined and the degree of magnitude assessed prior to dropping the E-3 alternate.
- * Upon further investigation as requested by Mike MacMullen, the following information was obtained in regard to potential residential development in the area of CH 16 and the E-3 alternate alignment. (Refer to attached Exhibit No. 1 for the location of street names and the E-3 alternate alignment. Also attached as Exhibit No. 2 is an aerial picture of the area.)

City plans for the area around CH 16

The land west of CH 16 (Johnson Street) is currently unincorporated, but is zoned agricultural (by extraterritorial zoning powers).

Subdivision east of Maple Street (1,600 feet east of CH 16)

Most of this unnamed subdivision is zoned R1 (single family), some is zoned R3 (multi-family residential) and Special Use. The April 1996 aerials show that this subdivision has been expanded since the original aerials were flown. The original set of aerials had shown only Evergreen Street (north of the E-3 centerline) extending east from Maple Avenue to Madison Street. The most recent set of aerials shows that the streets south of Evergreen Drive have been extended. From the north, these streets are Pinecrest and Scotchpine.

Gary Zeigler (City of Macomb) said that Pinecrest is constructed about half-way to Madison Street, and Scotchpine is constructed about 1/3 of the way to Madison Street, but both are planned to be completed to Madison. (The E-3 centerline follows Pinecrest through the subdivision.) Gary also indicated that Madison Street would be extended south 300 meters from South Verzel Street to James Street and south 150 meters from Pam Lane to Evergreen and then to Scotchpine, crossing the E-3 alignment.

Residential Displacements

Using the new aerial mapping, Alternate E-3 would bisect this subdivision, and would displace 5 farm residences and 9 non-farm residences. One of the non-farm displacements is a multi-family building on Maple. Five of the non-farm residences, including the multi-family residence, are within the subdivision proper, and three of the non-farm residences are on Maple Avenue immediately across the street from the subdivision. In addition to the displacements of existing homes, E-3 would also take roughly 30 other lots in the subdivision based on a 76 meter wide right-of-way for the proposed IL Route 336 alignment. (The number of lots could be greater if the profile through this area requires more right-of-way.) The revised impact table and bulleted list are attached as Exhibits No. 3 and 4.)

In conclusion, it is evident in reviewing 1993 and 1996 aerial photography, that residential housing is expanding in the vicinity of CH 16 and the E-3 alternate. Currently, the E-3 alternate displaced 9 residential homes with the potential for 30+ additional lots and resultant residential displacements in the future. Given the trend for continuing residential development and the resultant displacement impacts, it is suggested to drop the E-3 alternate from future study.

This concluded discussion comments for the south bypass alternate alignments. With the additional information received in regard to residential development south of Macomb in the area of CH 16 and the E-3 alignment, it was demonstrated that displacements would be significant. Therefore, it is suggested that the E-3 alternate be dropped from future study along with the E-4.2 alternate. Suggested alternates to carry forward are E-4 and E-4.1.

In conclusion, your written concurrence is requested as to the Purpose and Need for the Macomb Area Study as presented and summarized in these meeting minutes and also concurrence of the proposed alternate alignments to drop and those to carry forward as also discussed in the meeting minutes. Attached is a map labeled Exhibit No. 5 which is intended to simplify and summarize the recommended alternates to drop and those to carry forward for future detailed study.

